

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addiese: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
10/770,423	02/04/2004	Mike Soumokil	07781,0140-00	1939	
60668 SAP / FINNE	7590 04/09/2008 GAN, HENDERSON LLP	EXAM	EXAMINER		
901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW			SAEED, USMAAN		
WASHINGTO	ON, DC 20001-4413	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
			2166		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			04/09/2008	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/770,423	SOUMOKIL ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
USMAAN SAEED	2166	

	USMAAN SAEED	2166					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address							
THE REPLY FILED 06 March 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
 X The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appl for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods: 	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request				
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	date of the final rejection.						
no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la	The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: 16 box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TW.						
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).						
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.138(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checket. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount of shortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as				
The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp.	liance with 37 CER 41 37 must be t	iled within two months	of the date of				
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the					
AMENDMENTS							
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, i They raise new issues that would require further contains they raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below). 	nsideration and/or search (see NOTw);	E below);					
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or	ter form for appeal by materially rec	lucing or simplifying ti	ne issues for				
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a		ected claims.					
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1							
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.13		mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).				
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)							
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 	lowable if submitted in a separate, t	imely filed amendmer	it canceling the				
 For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided. 		be entered and an e	planation of				
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:							
Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) rejected:							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but	t before or on the date of filing a No	tion of Annual will not	he entored				
 The allibration of other evidence field after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome all rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fail:	to provide a				
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.				
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:				
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)						
13. Other:							
/Hosain T Alam/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2166							

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 08-06)

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The newly added claim limitations of: "current state assigned by a user through a dialogue displayed on a display device, and the data field has a link to the current state in a state value table comprising a plurality of states of the processing of the invoice" found in the amended independent claims 1, 8, 14, and 20, raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search.

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The newly added daim limitations found in the amended independent claims 1, 8, 14, and 20, raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search, and the claim limitations of the "finally rejected" claims are still met by Ludwig et al (U.S. PG Pub No. 2003/0004874 and Falk et al (U.S. PG Pub No. 2004/0111302).